

Dear Dave,

11/29/91

If "il finishes with the Post and clips what I've marked before we go to supper I'll enclose what I refer to. We both had the lab work for our annual physicals done this morning and after that she had to wait until after my physical therapy, so it was a late start.

I was surprised, pleasantly, to see Lally Weymouth's story on the Middle East negotiations, which I regard as fair, and Jackson's Diehl's, which buries but does include some of what I refer to as fair.

Because I have no reason to believe that the editorial and foreign-news staffs confer I have no reason to believe that my correspondence with Rosenfeld had anything to do with these stories, which are not the first in the Post recently in which it does give a little to what Israel is saying for the first time. For that matter, I also have no reason to believe that my letters to the new foreign editor, David Ignatius, influenced him.

I would like to believe that the Post decided on its own to stop being so crudely partial in favor of the BushArab position and so ^ucrudely dishonest in making no mention of Israel's. I would also like to think that henceforth it will try to be fair. It had not been at all until about a week ago, as I recall beginning with a Lally Weymouth article.

And I note still again if I could perceive accurately what was going on the pros and the reporters and editors on the story should have perceived it, too. Or, still again, the major media failures in time of crisis, when the costs can be terrible. And may yet be.

Now all except those of the Post's readers who have not seen these articles have some understanding of why Israel has done and is doing what it has done and is now doing. There is reason for them to understand that BushBaker have been very partisan and that they have been changing traditional US policy radically and without saying so.

I have not heard any news today since early morning so I do not know what if anything was said or done by anyone. I am inclined to believe that Israel will not attend the 12/4 meeting Bush set on his own, ^{deliberately}insulting Israel in the doing. The Post reported that and what State said in a way to hide what State really said that I saw and heard on TV. That it was still covering the BushBaker ass yesterday is not a good sign, though.

I'll be surprised if Israel agrees to discuss any of what they refer to as "substantive" matters at the next session. I believe that they will not until all the preliminaries are completed.

To a degree, if Shamir remains firm, Bush may have painted himself into a corner, if the Congress gets a correct understanding of what he has been up to, indicated in today's stories. He should by now see that he is not about to get another quick and cheap publicity break from this mess he created and if there are any sane heads around him they'll try to get him to see that he may hurt himself more than he can help by continuing to be the point man for the Arabs. This will be more true if the US Jewish community sounds off along the lines of these stories. Best, (Unless the Arabs have an October Surprise for him.)

Harry